

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 14-16 have been added. No new matter is presented.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Muramatsu, U.S. Patent 5,745,253. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites receiving a first image data; obtaining a second image data by developing the first image data; obtaining a third image data by compressing the second image data; comparing the volume of the first image data and a volume of the third image data; and storing the image data of which ever has a smaller volume. The Examiner asserts that Muramatsu teaches all of these features. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Supposing, as the Examiner asserts, that Muramatsu discloses first image data D2, second image data D2a and third image data (output of compressor 311), Muramatsu actually teaches comparing the second and third image data, not the first and third image data. Muramatsu discloses that the amount of post-compression data is compared with the amount of pre-compression data (col. 17, lines 35-39). The post-compression data corresponds to the third image data, but the pre-compression data corresponds to the second image data, not the first image data. It is the data which is fed to the compressor 311 (see Fig. 17). Thus, the features of claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested in Muramatsu. Accordingly, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Onodera, U.S. Patent 6,181,435. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 recites receiving a first image data; obtaining a second image data by developing the first image data; printing using the second image data; comparing a first time required for developing the first image data and a second time required for printing with the second image data; storing the first image data if the first time is shorter than the second time based on the result of the comparison.

The Examiner asserts that the coded raster data corresponds to the first image data. However, claim 8 recites that that first image data is received. Therefore, the image data received by the printer 1000 would actually correspond to the claimed first image data (col. 5, lines 15-17).

The Examiner then asserts that the compressed raster data corresponds to the second image data. Again, if the received image data is the first image data, the coded raster data must be the second image data, rather than the compressed raster data.

The Examiner further asserts that Onodera discloses transferring the raster data to the printing unit, which inherently leads to printing on a recording medium. The Examiner refers to col. 7, lines 27-28, but this disclosure actually states that raster data is transferred by the printing I/F unit 15 to the printing unit 16. This is not the same as printing the raster data, even if eventually something is printed. Claim 8 recites that the time required for printing the second image data is compared to the claimed first time. Since merely transferring data to the printing unit is not the same as printing, Onodera does not compute the time it took to print the data. The Examiner is not even alleging as such, but instead asserts that the time required for transferring band raster data by the printing unit corresponds to the time required for printing the second image data. This time is not the same as the time required for printing the second image data.

In light of the foregoing, the features of claim 8 are not taught or suggested by Onodera. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu in view of Yoshinari, Japanese patent application 9-193486. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Muramatsu fails to teach or suggest comparing the volume of the first image data with the volume of the third image data. Yoshinari likewise fails to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, neither cited reference, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claims 2, 3 and 5, either alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu in view of Yoshinari and further in view of Fall, U.S. Patent No. 5,764,863). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Muramatsu fails to teach or suggest comparing the volume of the first image data with the volume of the third image data. Both Yoshinari and Fall likewise fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claim 4. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu in view of Yoshinari and further in view of Kishida, U.S. Patent No. 5,995,722). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Muramatsu fails to teach or suggest comparing the volume of the first image data with the volume of the third image data. Both Yoshinari and Kishida likewise fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claim 6. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muramatsu in view of Yoshinari and further in view of Takeda, U.S. Patent No. 5,845,057). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Muramatsu fails to teach or suggest comparing the volume of the first image data with the volume of the third image data. Both Yoshinari and Takeda likewise fail to teach or suggest this feature. Accordingly, none of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claim 7. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onodera in view of Morris, U.S. Patent No. 6,097,419. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Onodera fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 8, from which claim 9 depends. Morris also fails to teach or suggest the features discussed above in connection with claim 8. Further, Morris is not being relied upon as teaching these features. Therefore, the features of claim 9 are not taught or suggested by the cited art, either alone or in combination. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Onodera in view of Kikuchi, U.S. Patent No. 5,779,378 and further in view of Morris. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 recites a receiver for receiving a first image data consisting of a printer language data; a generator for generating a second image data that consists of a bitmap data; a transmitter for transmitting the second image data to a printing unit for printing the image data on a recording medium; a comparator for comparing a first time required for developing the first image data and a specified second time; and a storage means for storing the first image data if the first time is shorter than the second time.

The Examiner asserts that Onodera teaches a comparison of a first time required for developing the first image data and a second time. However, claim 10 recites that this second time is a specified second time, whereas the second time in Onodera is actually very specifically the "time necessary for transferring band raster data by the printing I/F unit 15" (col. 6, lines 44-46). Thus, the second time of Onodera does not correspond to the claimed second time.

Further, as stated above, the first image data according to claim 10 is received image data in a printer language data. The Examiner is comparing this received image data with the coded raster data, which has been converted from printer description language. As stated above, the received image data in page description language would actually correspond to the claimed image

data, not the converted coded raster data. Furthermore, once the data is converted to coded raster data in band units (see col. 5, lines 18-19), it is no longer in printer language form.

The Examiner relies on Kickuchi to disclose the comparator, however since Onodera does not actually compare the second specified time, but rather compares a specific time which must be determined (i.e., is not "specified"), the combination of these references would still fail to teach or suggest the claimed features.

The Examiner recognizes that the first image and the second image of Onodera do not actually correspond to the claimed first and second image data, but asserts that Morris discloses converting printer language into bitmap data, and thus it would have been obvious to change the first and second image data formats in accordance with the teachings of Morris. The Examiner provides that the advantage of this modification would be to enable the data to initially be sent to the printer in the popular printer language format, and then, after conversion to bitmap, the image information having a plurality of bits could be quickly transferred to the printer engine.

First, as stated above, Onodera fails to teach several features of claim 10. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that there would not have been any motivation to have completely modified the formats of the image data manipulated in Onodera in the fashion suggested by the Examiner. To do so would completely change the invention of Onodera. First, Onodera already has the language in printer language format, but chooses to convert the data into coded raster data in band units. Thus, the teachings of Morris would need to be sufficient to lead one of ordinary skill in the art to completely deviate from much of what is disclosed in Onodera. There is simply insufficient evidence in the prior art of the desirability to so severely modify Onodera as to change the method disclosed therein. Applicant respectfully suggests that the Examiner has used impermissible hindsight to reconstruct the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the features of claim 10 are not taught or suggested by the cited art, either alone or in combination.

Claims 11 and 12 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies.

Claim 13 recites many of the features discussed above in connection with claims 1, 8 and 10. Thus, claim 13 is allowable for the reasons stated above. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Newly added claims 14-16 recite substantially the same features as discussed above and are therefore allowable for the foregoing reasons.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 325772014000.

Dated: January 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7753